

TITLE III—TAXATION OF S CORPORATION SHAREHOLDERS

Sec. 301. Uniform treatment of owner-employees under prohibited transaction rules—Provides that subchapter-S shareholder-employees no longer will be deemed to be owner-employees under the rules prohibiting loans to owner-employees from qualified retirement plans.

Sec. 302. Treatment of losses to shareholders—Loss recognized by a shareholder in complete liquidation of an S corporation would be treated as ordinary loss to the extent the shareholder's adjusted basis in the S corporation stock is attributable to ordinary income that was recognized as a result of the liquidation.

TITLE V—EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 401. Effective date—Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1995.

IMPROVING MEDICARE**HON. GEORGE P. RADANOVICH**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, recently, Mr. Frank J. O'Neill, a constituent of mine from Dunlap, CA, wrote to me about his concerns regarding Medicare. I think he expressed his views very well, and I want to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues his words, which were also printed in the Fresno Bee.

Mr. O'Neill recognizes the need to slow the unsustainable high rate of growth in Medicare spending. However, he points out that many other programs are in desperate need of reform, such as food stamps and Social Security disability.

I want to assure Mr. O'Neill that there is a very big difference between the two parties. Republicans are committed to protecting and improving Medicare. We also are committed to reforming every other area of our Government, rooting out waste and fraud, and getting the Federal Government out of functions that are more appropriately handled at the State or local level or by the people themselves. And I think our commitment will be borne out in the months ahead.

The people want us to save Medicare, but at the same time they want us to bring fundamental reform to other programs. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to heed Mr. O'Neill's wise words of advice:

[From the Fresno Bee, June 10, 1995]

MEDICARE RECIPIENT SAYS ALL PROGRAMS NEED EXAMINATION

(By Frank J. O'Neill)

George Wallace had it exactly right. While campaigning for president as an independent he said, "There's not a dime's worth of difference between Democrats and Republicans."

I was thrilled at the Republican landslide last November. I really thought it would make a big difference. I'm 68 years old. You'd think I'd know better.

As I write there is an American Association of Retired Persons announcement on the radio. In a doomsday voice the speaker is asking if I know what Congress is planning to do to Medicare. He asks, do I know what the reductions in Medicare will cost me?

Why isn't the AARP looking at the big picture and lobbying for a plan that will be

good for me, good for my children, good for the country? If they succeed in terrifying all the seniors it will only precipitate a partisan screaming match and solve nothing. Of course it will promote a "who's to blame" contest and generate innumerable bumper stickers for next year's election.

Is it possible that I don't understand the problem? My hero, Rush Limbaugh, coming from the right, challenges that I must understand that "something must be done about Medicare—it will be broke in 2002." Well, a pox on both their houses. I am willing to accept numbers that we say we can't keep spending at the current rate. I am also more than willing to cinch up my belt and contribute my share. But I am not willing to do it alone.

NOT ALONE

Limbaugh says the government has become a giant sow with everyone looking for a nipple. Well, he may be right. And I'll agree that one of the nipples may be labeled "Medicare," but what about all the others?

I'll share my nipple as soon as there is an overall plan to get everyone else to do the same thing. No way will I agree to be penalized as long as I can stand in line at a 7-Eleven in Henderson, Nev., watching a young 30-something buy a package of gooey cinnamon buns with food stamps and then walk across the store to play the slot machine with the change she received in cash. My Medicare is threatened when there is a big new sign in front of the Subway sandwich restaurants announcing, "We now accept food stamps!" Food stamps to eat out! And my Medicare is the economic culprit?

Even if a child's disability is the result of physical abuse inflicted by the parents, the child is still eligible for Social Security disability payments—payments made to the parents who caused the disability. A spokesman for Social Services says, "Well, it is extremely difficult to remove a child from the home of its natural parents!" Need money? Hurt the kid. While my Medicare is threatened.

Drug abusers are in many cases classified as disabled. As such they are eligible for Social Security disability payments. But my Medicare is threatened.

What is needed is an across-the-board analysis of these programs to make sure all facets are examined and treated fairly. The very first step is something that could be done quickly. Separate the Medicare program for seniors over 65 from all these other Social Security activities.

CLEAR DISTINCTION

The Republicans are reported to be surprised to find from a survey that most people don't realize that Medicare and Social Security are separate and different. Oh, yeah? If so how come the Part B payment I must make for Medicare is deducted from my Social Security check? And where does that money go? Into a "trust fund"? Sure. Just like my 40 years of Social Security payments.

I accept as a fact that the Medicare program needs a close examination but I will not support any revisions that penalize me without correcting abuses that are financially impacting the system.

AARP is wrong. Limbaugh is wrong. George Wallace was right.

IN HONOR OF GERALD W. OLSON

HON. PHIL ENGLISH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to honor Gerald W. Olson, a distinguished policy officer from Lawrence Park, who is retiring tomorrow, July 14, 1995, after 28 years of outstanding service to his community. Mr. Olson began his career as a part time police officer at the age of 27. In addition to serving on the Lawrence Park police force, he also protected his community as a volunteer fireman. While working to make our streets safer, Gerald is also heavily involved in Little League and American Legion Baseball.

A hero can be defined in many different ways. A soldier who is courageous in the face of death on a battlefield, a person who gives selflessly for the benefit of the whole or someone who makes a positive difference in the lives of others. Perhaps the most heroic act is to live your life in a honorable way. Gerald Olson has served his community in many facets and has shown that you can have an impact on the world even if you do so quietly, without the fanfare. He has been a role model to the children of his community and an example to us all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION**HON. DOUGLAS "PETE" PETERSON**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to an illness in the family, I was forced to miss rollcall votes 346 through 366, 389 through 391. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" to rollcalls 349, 354, 355, 358, 360, 361, 365, and "no" on rollcalls 346, 347, 348, 350, 351, 352, 353, 356, 357, 359, 362, 363, 364, 366, 389, 390, 391.

TRIBUTE TO THE WASHINGTON-BONAPART FAMILY REUNION**HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, the Washington-Bonapart family gathers this weekend to celebrate its 15th national family reunion, which has some of its roots in my district in Philadelphia, PA.

The Washington-Bonapart family reunion is composed of the descendants of Moses and Grace Washington, Sr. Grace was born as a slave in the West Indies, eventually immigrating to the United States as a free woman. She settled in Charleston, SC, where she met and later married her beloved husband, Moses. It is from this union that the Washington-Bonapart family was born, now more than 500 members strong.

Family members from six States, and 20 cities will gather in Washington this weekend for a celebration of family, community, and

heritage. Highlights of the weekend include an African cultural, fashion, and talent show, and honorary awards dinner, and a posthumous dedication ceremony to distinguished family member Jesse Nathaniel Hunt.

I am especially pleased to commemorate the Winder family of Philadelphia, PA, who are serving as key organizers of this special event. Their dedication to their family and community is most impressive, and will certainly be evident in every activity this weekend.

The Washington-Bonapart family motto is: The family is the strongest institution in the world, and its preservation is essential to a prosperous future for all humankind. I could not agree more. I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting the Washington-Bonapart family reunion, which I am certain will be a weekend to remember.

RECOGNIZING UNION CITY FOR ITS PARTICIPATION IN NATIONAL NIGHT OUT

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend Union City for its participation in National Night Out, 1995. On August 1, residents in this municipality of the 13th District will join fellow Americans across the country to create a night of celebration free from the fear of crime and drugs.

I wish also to pay tribute to the National Association of Town Watch in New Jersey for sponsoring the event. They have succeeded in developing community awareness within many American cities and towns by bringing concerned citizens to the forefront. Community leaders and law enforcement officers are joining them to send the message that crime will not be permitted to threaten our communities and dictate our lives.

I am proud to say I have dedicated citizens in my district creating safe neighborhoods through education and action. On this night Union City residents and law enforcement officers in participating cities will celebrate with a town-wide block party, contests, dances for community youth, concerts at various senior centers, safety demonstrations, and educational forums. These events are a continuation of past efforts whose full benefits will be felt for years to come in my district.

This admirable project is a nation-wide endeavor supported by over 8,000 communities throughout our 50 States. Their continuing aim is to focus America's attention on the alarming crime rates and the unacceptable level of drug abuse which has affected every community in our Nation. Police-citizen partnerships created by the efforts of these organizations have promoted cooperative crime prevention programs allowing Americans to come from behind their locked doors and join their neighbors in the fight for our Nation's safety.

The "12th Annual National Night Out" comes at a time when the leaders of our Nation are debating the appropriate methods of crime prevention here, in the Nation's Capital. But in Union City and in other communities around our great Nation, the people are taking a stand, defending their streets, their homes, and their families.

Union City officials are to be commended not only for their participation in National Night Out 1995 but also for their concern and their efforts. Their fight for safer communities gives me hope that America can build a crime and drug-free Nation for our children. I salute them today, thank them for their past efforts, and wish them luck in their future crime-fighting endeavors.

IN MEMORY OF EDWARD CHARLES BEDDINGFIELD, SR.

HON. GLENN POSHARD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express the sorrow of the people of Decatur and the 19th District at the passing of Mr. Edward C. Beddingfield. Ed's passing is a great loss to all that knew him, and the community he devoted his life to helping.

Ed worked for the Pontiac Division of General Motors for 11 years, and dreamed of one day owning his own automobile business. In 1989, Mr. Beddingfield's dream came true when he purchased a Buick dealership in Decatur, IL, and with much ambition and hard work, Edward turned his dealership into a thriving and successful business.

Mr. Speaker, Ed was involved in many things to help make his community a better place to work and live. He was a Millikin University Trustee, a Decatur sanitary district commissioner, and a pillar of the National Association of the Advancement of Colored People. He also served as president of Webster-Cantrell Hall's board of directors and on the boards of the First National Bank and the Metro Decatur Chamber of Commerce. In addition, he touched the lives of many children throughout central Illinois through his work with the Y.M.C.A., the Boys Club & Girls Club, and the Decatur-Macon County Opportunities Corp.'s summer jobs program.

Mr. Ed Beddingfield was a true example of a public servant. Mr. Speaker, Ed Beddingfield will not be forgotten. His everlasting love, commitment, and dedication serves as a living monument to his family, friends, and neighbors. I want to take this opportunity to offer my condolences to all the people that knew and loved this fine man.

INTRODUCING THE PARENTAL CHOICE IN TELEVISION ACT OF 1995

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 1995

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Representatives JIM MORAN, DAN BURTON, JOHN SPRATT, and I, along with a long list of bipartisan cosponsors from every region of the United States, are introducing the Parental Choice in Television Act of 1995.

We are introducing this bill with the intention of offering it as an amendment when the telecommunications bill comes to the House floor in July.

It is supported by a broad coalition of groups from the PTA to the AMA.

It is supported by 90 percent of the American public.

In short, its time has come.

In my view, there is no more compelling governmental interest in the United States today than providing families a healthy, safe environment in which to raise healthy, productive children.

The fact is that television is one of the most important influences on our children's lives. We might wish it were different, but that won't bring us back to the 1950's when children watched relatively little TV. Today they watch 4 to 7 hours every day. "Electronic teacher" for many children, but what it teaches to young children is scary. The average American child has seen 8,000 murders and 100,000 acts of violence by the time he or she leaves elementary school.

Parents know what's going on. I have held six hearings over the last 2 years on the subject of children and televised violence. In every hearing I have heard both compelling testimony about the harmful effects of negative television on young children, and about the efforts of industry to reduce gratuitous violence. But parents don't care whether the violence is gratuitous or not. When you have young children in your home, you want to reduce all violence to a minimum.

That's why parents are not impressed with the temporary promises of broadcast executives to do better. Parents know that the good deeds of one are quickly undermined by the bad deeds of another.

The pattern is familiar. Parents plea for help in coping with the sheer volume and escalating graphics of TV violence and sexual material. Congress expresses concern. The industry screams "first amendment". The press says they're both right, calling on Congress to hold off and calling on industry to tone things down.

Meanwhile, parents get no help.

Until parents actually have the power to manage their own TV sets using blocking technology, parents will remain dependent on the values and programming choices of executives in Los Angeles and New York who, after all, are trying to maximize viewership, not meet the needs of parents.

In 1993, a USA Today survey found that 68 percent of its readers supported mandating the inclusion of V-chip technology in new TV sets. By 1996, a similar survey found that this number had risen to 90 percent.

Clearly the public is clamoring for solutions which make it easier to control their own TV sets.

That is why we in the House intend to move forward with the V-Chip.

We will give the industry a year to develop a ratings system and activate blocking technology on a voluntary basis, but if they fail to act, then the legislation will require the FCC to:

First, form an advisory committee, including parents and industry, to develop a ratings system to give parents advance warning of material that might be harmful to children;

Second, prescribe rules for transmitting those ratings to TV receivers, and

Third, require TV set manufacturers to include blocking technology in new TV sets so that parents can block programs that are rated, or block programs by time or by program.